

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 have been rejected. Claims 1 to 21 are in this case. The Office Action on Page 2 section 1 “Detailed Action” incorrectly states that claims 1-10 are pending. It is respectfully pointed out that claims 1 - 21 are pending in this case. Claim 1 has been amended to remove the word “had”. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the honoring by the Examiner of their request to include the preliminary amendment and by sending a non-final Office Action. No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections -35 USC § 103

Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. 5,958,005 to Thorne et al. (hereinafter “Thorne”) in view of U.S. 6,065,048 to Higley (hereinafter “Higley”).

As to claims 1 and 8, the Office Action alleges that Thorne teaches in column 3, lines 12-23 “...preprocessing said email to create a modified email that has a link to a stored image of the body from the email substituted for the body of the email...” as required by claims 1 and 8. However Thorne is silent in that section or anywhere else about a stored image of the body of the e-mail, and about substituting the body of the email by a link to that image. Accordingly, Thorne does not teach or suggest the process and the method as claimed in claims 1 and 8. As stated in the Office Action, Higley teaches HTTP server and URLs included in an email. However, Higley does not teach “...preprocessing said email to create a modified email that has a link to a stored image of the body from the email substituted for the body of the email...” Higley is silent about using a URL for substituting it with the body of an email. Higley in FIG. 4 shows that the body of an email will

remain substantially intact and may be transported and received either as text or in HTML format. FIGs. 6-9 of Higley demonstrate that the body of the email remains unchanged and that the body of the email is not replaced by a URL to an image of the body of the email. According to Higley, a URL may further be included in the email in addition to the body or in the body of the email. However, Higley does not provide any suggestion or motivation to replace a body of an email with a URL to an image of the body of the email. Accordingly, neither Thorne, nor Higley, nor the combination thereof, teaches or suggests amended claim 1 and claim 8 and the allowance of these claims is respectfully requested. Further, allowance of claims 2-7 which depend from amended claim 1 and of claim 9 which depends from claim 8 is respectfully requested.

Claim 10 was rejected on the same basis as claims 1 and 8. Claim 10 requires “...preprocessing said email by removing and storing the original body of the email and creating a modified email by replacing the original body of the email with directions for the recipient on how to access the stored contents of the original body of the email...” Thorne, as shown in FIG. 3, modifies a header of an email, and does not remove and store the original body of an email. Nor does Thorne replace the original body with directions to the stored content of the body of the email. Neither Thorne, Higley nor their combination teaches or suggests removing and storing the original body of the email, replacing it with directions on how to access it. Accordingly, allowance of claim 10 is respectfully requested.

Claim 11 was rejected on the same basis as claims 1 and 8. Claim 11 requires “...storing a file of a body to an email; creating a modified email that includes a link to the file...” Thorne and Higley are silent about storing a file of a body to an email and creating a modified email that includes a link to the file. Accordingly, neither Thorne nor Higley nor the combination thereof teaches or

suggests the method of claim 11 and allowance of this claim is respectfully requested. Further, allowance of claims 12-16, which depend from claim 11, is also respectfully requested.

Claim 17 was rejected on the same basis as claims 1 and 8. Claim 17 requires "...having means for storing a file of a body to an email, for creating a modified email that includes a link to the file ..." Thorne and Higley are silent about means for storing a file of a body to an email and creating a modified email that includes a link to the file. Accordingly, neither Thorne nor Higley nor the combination thereof teaches or suggests the system of claim 17 and allowance of this claim is respectfully requested. Further, allowance of claims 18-21, which depend from claim 17, is respectfully requested.

It is believed that all objections set forth in the previous Office Action have been fully met, and favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at 732-815-0404 to discuss any additional objections.

Respectfully Submitted,

DIEHL SERVILLA LLC
77 Brant Avenue
Suite 210
Clark, New Jersey 07066
732 815 0404

Date: March 4, 2008

By /GlenM.Diehl, Reg. #33377/
Glen M. Diehl
Reg. No. 33,377